

## **Trent Radio Indicators of Failure**

Includes:

**Final Report**

**Part 1: Evaluation Template**

**Part 2: Results Reporting**

**Part 3: Other Academic Deliverables**

**By Lily Mills**

Completed for:

Trent Radio

Supervising Professor: Prof. Ray Dart, Trent University

Trent Centre for Community-Based Education

Department: Business Administration

Course Code: ADMN 483H

Course Name:

Term: Winter 2007

Date of Project Submission: April, 2007

Project ID: 723

**Call Number:**

**Trent Radio**  
**Indicators of Failure**  
**Evaluation Template**

*Developed by Lily J. Mills*  
*Winter Semester 2007*

**Purpose:**

This evaluation has been designed for use by Trent Radio to measure annual elements of failure in operations/services using the three following forms of failure:

- Radio Facility Failure – outlining Trent Radio’s shortcomings as a radio facility including aspects of its technical equipment (reliability, user-friendliness, etc.), accessibility, physical plant provisions, resources, meeting identified radio standards, etc.;
  - Community Service Role Failure – outlining Trent Radio’s (in)ability to contribute to local culture, reach out and appeal to the Trent community (in all its manifestations) and other members, provide an artistic and expressive outlet, to teach/educate and provide an all-around positive experience for all programmers, volunteers, and other community individuals, etc.;
  - Business/Operational Failure – outlining possibilities to measure failure in and amongst various business elements of Trent Radio, such as the Board of Directors, Programmers, Volunteers, Staff, Annual Goals, and Finances.
- These various elements of Trent Radio have been transposed into measurable metrics. Measurements are expressed in terms of failure in order to identify points where Trent Radio did not yield 100% performance.
  - This quantitative evaluation mode is complemented by opportunities for qualitative commentary.

## **Evaluation Development**

The following texts were used in the development of the evaluation:

- *Six Thinking Hats* by Edward De Bono;
- *Measuring and Enhancing The Productivity of Service and Government Organizations* by Marvin E. Mundel, Ph. D.;
- *Organizational Surveys* Edited by Allen I. Kraut;
- *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* Edited by Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson;
- *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting* by Frank W. Peers;
- *Community Radio: The Development of a Voluntary Organization* by Elizabeth G. Baldwin;

These texts were used to guide the thought process, which itself was fairly organic. Areas of concern for each form of failure were brainstormed jointly between the student-consultant and Trent Radio's General Manager, John K. Muir. Developing a thorough knowledge of Trent Radio's operations enabled the student to identify means for measurement of the organization's performance in these areas of concern.

## **Documents and Process**

### General Survey Guidelines

- The following schedule was followed for the administration of the Programmer and Volunteer/Staff surveys:
  - Radio Facility Failure Surveys: Late February
  - Community Service Role Failure Surveys: Early March
  - Business/Operational Failure: Late March.
- Surveys should be printed off or copied for the Master Copies and made available at the Trent Radio site for filling out. Survey fillers should then be instructed to deposit completed surveys in the Trent Radio mailbox or the Propaganda slot box on site.
- Programmers, Volunteers and Staff should be notified via e-mail upon the release of each survey. An electronic file of the survey should also be sent with this notification e-mail in order to give the option of filling out the survey and returning it electronically; however, this method could not ensure anonymity.

- The help of Operators should be issued to encourage Programmers to fill out the surveys. A note should be left in the Operator's communication book with every survey, and Operators should be duly thanked for their help.
- No safeguards have yet been established to prevent individuals from filling out more than one survey; Programmers, Volunteers and Staff have thus far been trusted to their honour in this regard.
- An initial e-mail should be released in early February to alert Programmers, Volunteers and Staff of the upcoming survey process (see Appendix A).
- Specific instructions for converting survey results to evaluation metrics are included on the proper sheets.
- Amalgamation of the survey results will be facilitated by the Excel programme developed to complement this evaluation process.

#### Radio Facility Failure

- *Report RF5 – Tracking Inaccessibility to the Air:* This document is to be maintained throughout the year by the Programme Director in order to document instances of unresolved scheduling conflicts. The Reports will be taken into account in the cumulative evaluation. The Report will be best kept in digital form until the completion of the evaluation, allowing flexibility of space for recording details.
- *Form U1 – Radio Facility Failure, Programmer Evaluation:* This survey gathers Programmer's opinions concerning accessibility, physical plant provisions, resources and equipment.
- *Form E1 – Radio Facility Failure, General Volunteer / Staff Evaluation:* This survey gathers Volunteer and Staff opinions concerning physical plant provisions, resources, and equipment.
- *Report RF1 – Tracking File Loss, Physical or Digital:* This record is meant to be maintained by the General Manager throughout the year to record instances of file loss which may indicate failures such as lack of communication, lack of storage space or lack of reliable equipment. The Reports will be taken into account in the cumulative evaluation. The Report will be best kept in digital form until the completion of the evaluation, allowing flexibility of space for recording details.
- *Report RF2 – Tracking Tenant, Neighbour and Community Complaints:* This record is meant to be maintained by the General Manager throughout the year to record instances of complaints from

the upstairs tenant, neighbours and the general Peterborough community regarding the Physical Plant and other operations. Typical landlord complaints such as broken doorknobs need not be recorded. More substantial complaints such as noise, traffic and other disruptions caused by Trent Radio should be considered for instances of failure. The Reports will be taken into account in the cumulative evaluation. The Report will be best kept in digital form until the completion of the evaluation, allowing flexibility of space for recording details.

- *Report RF3 – Tracking Equipment Failure:* This record is meant to be maintained by the General Manager throughout the year to record major instances of equipment failure. The equipment in questions includes not only broadcast equipment, but recording, digitizing and operating equipment as well (except streaming technology specific equipment). The Reports will be taken into account in the cumulative evaluation. The Report will be best kept in digital form until the completion of the evaluation, allowing flexibility of space for recording details.
- *Report RF 4 – Tracking Streaming Technology:* This record is meant to be maintained by the General Manager throughout the year to record instances of failure with the various aspects of Streaming Technology. The Reports will be taken into account in the cumulative evaluation. The Report will be best kept in digital form until the completion of the evaluation, allowing flexibility of space for recording details.
- *Trent Radio Failure Summary 1 – Radio Facility Failure:* This document enables the results from the surveys and reports to be converted to measures of failure to ultimately find a total radio facility failure measurement. This Summary is to be completed by the General Manager.

#### Community Service Role Failure

- *Form PDI – Community Service Role Failure, Programme Director's Evaluation:* This form is meant to initiate the Programme Director to reflect on failures in programming. Failures in programming certainly to not reflect on the performance of the Programme Director per se; he or she is consulted as the knowledgeable authority on Trent Radio's programming.

- *Form U2 – Community Service Role Failure, Programmer*  
*Evaluation:* This survey is meant to find Programmers' opinions concerning how well/poorly Trent Radio provides a community service.
- *Form E2 – Community Service Role Failure, Volunteer / Staff*  
*Evaluation:* This survey is meant to find Volunteer and Staff opinions concerning how well/poorly Trent Radio acts as a community service (specifically in providing fulfilling work and volunteer opportunities).
- *Report CSR 1 – Internal Conflict Report:* Empty forms of Report CSR 1 are to be made available to all Programmers, Volunteers and Staff year-round. The forms instruct that the reporter deposit the form in the secured Trent Radio mailbox folded and labeled to the preferred Trent Radio recipient (for discrepancy). Although the General Manager may not necessarily be privy to the details of each report, staff recipients should report the quantitative statistic for recording.
- *Trent Radio Failure Summary II – Community Service Role Failure:* This document enables the results from the surveys and reports to be converted to measures of failure to ultimately find a total community service role failure measurement. This Summary is to be completed by the General Manager.

#### Business/Operational Failure

- *Form B1 – Business/Operational Failure, Board of Directors Member*  
*Evaluation:* This survey is meant to gather opinions from the Board of Directors regarding board structure, training, communications, effectiveness, operations, and fulfillment.
- *Form U3 – Business/Operational Failure, Programmer Evaluation:*  
This survey is meant to gather opinions from Programmers regarding communications, staffing and general operations.
- *Form E3 – Business/Operational Failure, General Volunteer / Staff*  
*Evaluation:* This survey is meant to gather opinions from Volunteers and Staff regarding communications, operations, effectiveness and efficiency.
- *Trent Radio Failure Summary III – Business Operational Failure:* This document enables the results from the surveys and reports to be converted to measures of failure to ultimately find a total community service role failure measurement. This Summary is to be completed by the General Manager.

## Qualitative Reports

- *Defining Trent Radio*: See Appendix B. This questionnaire offers insight into what Trent Radio's primary stakeholders conceptualize Trent Radio to be. While responses do not necessarily note positives or negatives (although they commonly do), they can be compared to Trent Radio's aims and goals to reveal if reality is in fact complementary or contradictory to a perceived state of perfection.
- *WE F\*-ed UP!!*: See Appendix C. This report, like Report CSR 1, should be made available to Programmers, Volunteers, and Staff throughout the year. Although no quantitative component has been developed to link this document to the Failure Summaries, these forms provide documentation of concrete examples of Trent Radio's failures. These documents can be used for ongoing learning as well as comparison to areas of summaries which would be relevant to the documented incident.

## Evaluation Completion

- Upon the completion of all forms, reports and summaries areas of high failure can then be identified and evaluated. Results, specifically exceptionalities of high failure, should be reported to the Board of Directors and the Membership. Opportunities for reactive, remedial action can then be prioritized and developed based on the concerns expressed following the final report. While these numbers indicate areas of failure, causes of failure must be identified in order to remedy and prevent further failures. Possible routes of action include task committees, further qualitative surveys, and forums.

## Appendices

- *Appendix A*: Introduction to the surveys e-mail.
- *Appendix B*: Defining Trent Radio Questionnaire
- *Appendix C*: WE F\*-ed UP!! Report Form

Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_

**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Radio Facility Failure**  
**- Programmer Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

Accessibility

1. How adequately has Trent Radio been able to schedule your program according to your scheduling requests? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

2. How adequate was your initial training in the Trent Radio facility in the use of equipment? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

3. After your initial training, how adequate was continued support and guidance in the use of equipment? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many incidents have you experienced in which you never received proper training or support with Trent Radio equipment during the past period? \_\_\_\_\_

Physical Plant

5. How would you rate your working space within Trent Radio, in terms of physical space, heating, air quality, lighting, etc.? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you feel you need (more) physical storage space in order to facilitate your ability to deliver your program on a continued basis? Yes / No

7. Do you feel you need (more) digital storage space in order to facilitate your ability to deliver your program on a continued basis? Yes / No



8. Have you encountered any physical barriers accessing integral elements of the Trent Radio facility?

Yes / No

If yes, please describe:

9. How would you rate the Trent Radio facility location in terms of convenience and accessibility? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

Resources

10. How would you rate Trent Radio's provision of information and/or aide in finding information to help you develop your program? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

11. How user-friendly is Trent Radio's music archive online search portal? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How user-friendly and easily accessible is Trent Radio's vinyl collection? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

13. How user-friendly is Trent Radio's digital music archive retrieval system? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

14. How would you rate the breadth and variety of the Trent Radio music archive (including vinyl and digital resources)? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

15. How well does Trent Radio keep its music archive up-to-date and current? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

16. Do you feel that any particular group, genre, or time frame has been ignored in the Trent Radio music archive?

Yes / No

If yes, then which? \_\_\_\_\_

17. How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion for either an audio or informational resource in the period?

\_\_\_\_\_

18. How would you rate the "browsability" of the Trent Radio music archive?

\_\_\_\_\_

19. How would you rate the usefulness of the Trent Radio music archive?

\_\_\_\_\_

20. Do you feel that you would use and benefit from an expanded spoken word archive?

Yes / No

Equipment

21. How user-friendly is the Trent Radio equipment? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

22. How would you rate your familiarity with the entirety of Trent Radio audio equipment? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

23. Do you find that Trent Radio's current equipment presents any barriers to your ability to create the program you envision?

Yes / No

If yes, please explain:

24. Do you feel that Trent Radio's equipment is technically adequate?

Yes / No

25. How would you rate Trent Radio's equipment in terms of usefulness? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for helping us to find our failures ☺**



**Date Received:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Community Service Role Failure**  
**- Programmer Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

Trent Radio

1. How well would you say that you know and understand the aims of Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

2. From your interactions, how competent do you feel the Trent Radio staff are in terms of running a community radio station? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Has Trent Radio ever asked for your input concerning their operations? Yes / No

4. How comfortable do you feel giving feedback to Trent Radio about their operations / how (well) they do things? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

Trent Radio and You

5. How well has Trent Radio taught you about radio, technically and as an art or means of communication? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

6. How satisfied are you with the existing means for you to receive feedback from listeners? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

7. How satisfied are you with the feedback you receive from the Programme Director? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Do you feel that this feedback needs to occur more frequently? Yes / No

9. How well does Trent Radio support programme development, from helping you create your original show idea to helping you expand your current programme? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

10. Are you made to feel that the Trent Radio staff are truly there for you (the programmers)?

Yes / No

11. How has Trent Radio affected you? (1-5) (1 = quite negative, 3 = neutral, 5 = quite positive)

\_\_\_\_\_

12. Have you been invited/encouraged to participate in Trent Radio in other ways (i.e. joining the Board, volunteering, or attending the annual general meeting)?

Yes / No

If not, would you be interested? Yes / No

13. How would you rate the user-friendliness of the Trent Radio website, www.trentradio.ca? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

14. How would you rate the usefulness of the Trent Radio website? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

Programming and Community

15. How effective do you think Trent Radio is as a means for interacting with the Trent/Peterborough community? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

16. Can you think of any examples of how community was fostered through your programme (for example, you met others with similar interests or community members actively engaged in calling-in to your show)?

Yes / No

17. How open do you feel Trent Radio is towards diverse political and/or cultural views/ideas? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you feel that Trent Radio does enough in terms of fostering its own community (for example, providing opportunities for programmers to meet and mingle)?

Yes / No

19. Do you think you will be returning to programming again at Trent Radio in the upcoming season?

Yes / No

If not, why not?

If you are new to Trent Radio this season...

20. How welcome and comfortable have you been made to feel at Trent Radio? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

21. How would you rate Trent Radio's Studio A training? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

22. How well informed do you feel in are in terms of rules and the way things work? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

23. Are you familiar with all the Trent Radio staff?

Yes / No

Thanks for helping us try to find Trent Radio's faults ☺



**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Business / Operational Failure**  
**- Programmer Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

1. How adequate do you feel current means and channels are for keeping you informed and up-to-date on what's going on at Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Do you feel that Trent Radio is adequately staffed to get things done and done properly? Yes / No
3. How smooth did you find the program proposal process? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Do you think that Trent Radio takes too much time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts? Yes / No
5. Do you think that Trent Radio takes enough time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts? Yes / No
6. If you are not a Trent student, do you feel that your membership fee is reasonable? (N/A for Trent students) Yes / No

**That's it! This last one was a short one for you. Thanks for your participation!!**





**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Radio Facility Failure**  
**- General Volunteer / Staff Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation “(1-5)” are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

Physical Plant

1. How would you rate your working space within Trent Radio, in terms of physical space, heating, air quality, lighting, etc.? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

2. Do you feel you need more physical storage space in order to perform your duties? Yes / No

3. Do you feel you need more digital storage space in order to perform your duties? Yes / No

4. Have you encountered any physical barriers accessing integral elements of the Trent Radio facility? Yes / No

5. How would you rate the Trent Radio facility location in terms of convenience and accessibility? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

Resources

6. How would you rate Trent Radio’s provision of informational resources and/or aide in finding informational resources to help you perform your duties? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

Equipment

7. How adequate is Trent Radio’s equipment for meeting your needs in order to perform your duties (e.g. computers, etc.)? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

**Thanks for helping us find our failures ☺**



**For Office Use Only:**  
**Form** \_\_\_\_\_ **of** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date Received:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Community Service Role Failure**  
**- General Volunteer / Staff Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

1. When you leave Trent Radio, how satisfied do you feel about how you spent your day? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
2. If someone told you that you would be involved with Trent Radio forevermore, how good would you feel about it? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
3. How would you rate the quality of your time at Trent Radio thus far as a learning experience? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
4. How would you rate future potential learning opportunities with Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
5. How supportive is Trent Radio in helping you to do the work it asks of you? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
6. How confident are you about the future of Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
7. How much do you enjoy the company of the people you work with, programmers, employees and volunteers? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
8. How well does Trent Radio provide you with flexibility and support in working hours, personal emergencies and stressful moments? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_
9. How well does Trent Radio foster community and allow opportunities for its various members to socialize outside of the workplace/studio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for helping us find our faults ☺**



**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Business/Operational Failure**  
**- General Volunteer / Staff Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

1. How well do you feel that you are kept up to date on what's going on at Trent Radio and the decisions of the Board? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

2. How much stress would you say you experience due to faulty, inefficient and/or nonsensical operations at Trent Radio? (1-5, 5 being lots of stress!!!) \_\_\_\_\_

3. Do you feel you are given enough time at the beginning of the year to get things up and running before the regular season starts? Yes / No

4. How well is the work you do connected to the aims of Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

5. In reviewing your job description (if applicable), how many of your duties are you unable to pay due attention due to needs in other areas? (N/A if not applicable.) \_\_\_\_\_

6. How would you rate the clarity of roles and responsibilities at Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

7. Do you feel you have enough authority and empowerment to do your work efficiently and independently? Yes / No

8. Do you feel that you are adequately compensated for the work you do (taking into consideration Trent Radio's financial constraints)? Yes / No

**Thank you once again for helping us find our faults! ☺**



**Form PD1**

**Trent Radio Failure Summary  
Community Service Role Failure  
- Programme Director's Evaluation -**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

For the period of: \_\_\_\_\_

1. How many instances of duplication in programming occurred this past season (i.e. two shows about trout fishing would be one instance of duplication)?

\_\_\_\_\_

2. How many programmers failed to return this year, for reasons other than having moved out of town (that you know of)?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Did Trent Radio manage to attract as many programmers as it did in the previous period? Yes / No

If not, by how much did TR not meet last year's number?

\_\_\_\_\_

4. How many applications for regularly-running programming were received?

\_\_\_\_\_ Of these, how many did *not* evolve into regular programmes?

\_\_\_\_\_

5. In comparing last season to this season, are there any interest areas or political/cultural ideas which were represented previously which are not being represented now? Yes / No

If so, how many are no longer being represented?

\_\_\_\_\_

6. In your opinion, what percentage of programming in this period does not actively help Trent Radio achieve its aims?

\_\_\_\_\_

This information will help Trent Radio find its failures ☺





**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Business / Operational Failure**  
**- Board of Directors Member Evaluation -**

*\*\*Questions which terminate with the notation "(1-5)" are requesting a rating between 1 and 5, 1 being unsatisfactory and 5 being beyond your expectations. Half-point ratings (such as 3.5) are accepted.\*\**

Please feel free to reflect upon your numerical responses on the back of this sheet (or print up reflections and attach).

1. Do you feel that seven (7) members is an adequate / effective number of Directors for the Board? Yes / No

If no, do you feel that there are too many or too few members?

Too many / Too Few

2. How well do you feel that the provisions in Article III (Board of Directors) of Trent Radio By-Law No. 1 support the operations and best interests of the Board and Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

Which sections, if any, need particular attention for revision, in your opinion?

3. How well do you feel that you've been prepared / trained / informed in order to perform your duties and be a part of the Board of Directors for Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

4. How well do you feel that other Board members have been prepared / trained / informed in order to perform their duties and be a part of the Board of Directors for Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

5. How well informed do you feel you are before meetings to discuss and make votes on the decisions at hand? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

6. How would you rate current means and channels of communication in terms of your ability to stay informed and up-to-date with what's going on at Trent Radio? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

7. How well-chosen are the topics for Board Development sessions?  
How well do they address your needs as a Board member or the  
needs of the Board as a team? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

8. How well prepared and effective would you say the Board  
Development sessions are? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

9. Do you feel that the current frequency of Board meetings is  
appropriate and effective?

Yes / No

If not, do you think the Board needs more meetings or fewer  
meetings?

More / Fewer

10. How would you rate the general effectiveness of meetings of the  
Board? In other words, how meaningful do you feel these meetings  
are to Trent Radio? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

11. How would you rate the quality of the discussion which takes  
place at Board meetings? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How would you rate the current Board make-up, in terms of  
members who represent and exhibit a diversity of ideas and are  
supportive of constructive conversation? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

13. When the Board of Directors makes a decision, how confident do  
you feel that this decision will come through in practice? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

14. How well do you feel the Board follows up on the results of their  
decisions? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

15. How stressful do you find being a Trent Radio Board of Director  
member to be? (1-5, 5 being extremely stressful)

\_\_\_\_\_

16. How would you rate the Board's performance this period in terms  
of realistic and measurable goal-setting? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

17. How well do you feel that the current informal/ad-hoc committee  
structure/system adequately addresses and supports the operations of  
Trent Radio and the decisions of the Board? (1-5)

\_\_\_\_\_

18. If you are new to the Board, how open, accepting and supportive  
were the pre-existing Board members during your first meetings and  
activities? (1-5; NA if not applicable)

\_\_\_\_\_

19. How well do you feel that the Board of Directors is able to recognize when it needs or could benefit from external advice? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

20. Is it always clear who is responsible for what? Yes / No

21. How well does the timing of meetings work for you? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

22. How adequate is the meeting space? (1-5) \_\_\_\_\_

Please note imperfections:

23. Do you believe that the Board has ever suffered from the following symptoms of groupthink in within the past period?

- Sense of invincibility (excessive optimism and risk-taking) Yes / No
- Collective rationalization Yes / No
- Stereotyping of "enemies" Yes / No
- Pressure against dissent of opinion Yes / No

24. Would you like to continue as a member of the Board of Directors in the coming season? *(This question is in no way an official inquiry concerning whether or not you will be continuing as a member in the coming season. It is asking if you would like to do so, regardless of external situations and whether or not you actually will.)* Yes / No

**Thank you for your participation ☺**



Hello again Trent Radio Volunteers, Staff, and Programmers,

The following questions are based on six organizational metaphors. Please have a look at them and answer those which inspire you – answer one, some, all or none at all (if you don't feel that Trent Radio fits any of these metaphors). Answers can be as short or long as you wish. Elaborations and ramblings are welcome!

You can reply in the facebook discussion, via e-mail to [lilymills@trentu.ca](mailto:lilymills@trentu.ca), or if you would prefer greater anonymity, simply type up and print off your survey and drop it off in the locked Trent Radio mailbox at the front door. In order to keep moving along with the project, it would be great if I could have your responses by February 21, 2007.

Through these questions I'm trying to uncover perceptions about Trent Radio, what it does and what it should be doing. Have fun! Go crazy!

### Questions

1. If Trent Radio was a machine, what would it make or do?
2. If Trent Radio was an organism, where would it fit in its food chain? How does it survive (cow eats grass) and what does it in turn help to survive (cow feeds calf)?
3. Remember in cartoons those shots of looking into someone's brain and seeing monkeys or a spider web or nothing at all? If you could look into Trent Radio's brain (or the brain that is Trent Radio) what would be going on?
4. If Trent Radio was a culture, what values and beliefs would it be known for (like the rumour that Canadians are exceptionally polite)?
5. If Trent Radio was a political system, what would it be (for example, anarchy, democracy, tyranny, etc.)? For a full list of political systems, see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_forms\\_of\\_government](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_forms_of_government).

6. If Trent Radio was a brainwasher, what would its subliminal messages tell you?

Thanks for your help! I really look forward to your responses!

Lily J. Mills  
lilymills@trentu.ca



# ***WE F\*-ed UP!!***

***(The F stands for Failed...)***

This is an official Trent Radio Failure Report. Obvious failures, or alternatively, opportunities for learning, are open for documentation by any and all stakeholders of Trent Radio, be they programmers, volunteers, staff, board members, listeners, non-listeners, or other community members. These reports will be reviewed at the end of the regular season each year. You need not reveal your identity.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please give the Failure a title:

\_\_\_\_\_

Please describe the events involved in the failure and how it was or was not yet resolved:

Please deposit in the Trent Radio mailbox. Thank you for helping us to find our faults. ☺





**For Office Use Only:**

**Date Received:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Received by:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Report CSR 1**

**Internal Conflict Report**

*\*\*To be deposited in the locked Trent Radio mailbox (at front door). Please fold and label with the name of the preferred Trent Radio staff recipient.*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Is this the first Conflict Report you have generated in reference to this particular conflict?

Yes / No

If not, when did you file any previous reports associated with this conflict?

Please describe the nature of the conflict and the events which transpired:

Did Trent Radio staff assist or Board assist in the resolution of this conflict?

On a scale of 1-5, 1 being horribly and 5 being extremely well, how well do you feel Trent Radio handled this conflict?

\_\_\_\_\_





















**Report RF5**

**Tracking: Inaccessibility to the Air**

**\*\*To be completed by Programme Director**

For the period of: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of Unresolved Scheduling Incident</b>



**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Part I - Radio Facility Failure**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

For the period of: \_\_\_\_\_

*\*\*Those questions terminating with the expression "[5 - Avg.]" indicate that the Failure Point count shall be determined by averaging the results of all referenced forms and finding the difference between that average and the top rating (5).*

Accessibility

- |   | <b>Failure Points</b> |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. How often in this period have scheduling problems remained unresolved? (Reference: Report RF5)   | _____                 |
| 2. How unsuccessful has Trent Radio been in scheduling programs according to programmers scheduling requests? (Reference: U1-1. [5 - Avg.])                                       | _____                 |
| 3. How inadequately has Trent Radio provided initial training to programmers? (Reference: U1-2. [5 - Avg.])   | _____                 |
| 4. How inadequately has Trent Radio provided continued support and guidance to programmers in the use of equipment? (Reference: U1-3. [5 - Avg.])                                 | _____                 |
| 5. How many incidents have programmers claimed to have never received adequate training or support during with Trent Radio equipment during this review period? (Reference: U1-4) | _____                 |

---

**Total Failure Points for Accessibility**

Physical Plant

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 5. How inadequate are Trent Radio working spaces in terms of physical space, heating, air quality, lighting, etc.? (Reference: U1-5, E1-1 [5 - Avg.]) | _____ |
| 6. How many programmers are dissatisfied with physical storage space provisions? (Reference: U1-6)  | _____ |
| 7. How many programmers are dissatisfied with digital storage space provisions? (Reference: U1-7)   | _____ |

**Failure Points**

8. How many employees / volunteers are dissatisfied with physical storage space provisions? *(Reference: E1-2)*

\_\_\_\_\_

9. How many employees / volunteers are dissatisfied with digital storage space provisions? *(Reference: E1-3)*

\_\_\_\_\_

10. How often in this period have Trent Radio employees, volunteers, and programmers suffered a loss of physical or digital files due to improper or insecure storage? *(Reference: Report RF1)*

\_\_\_\_\_

11. How often in this period have Trent Radio employees, volunteers, and programmers encountered any physical barriers accessing integral elements of the Trent Radio facility? *(Reference: U1-8, E1-4)*

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How inconvenient and inaccessible do Trent radio employees, volunteers, and programmers find the Trent Radio location? *(Reference: U1-9, E1-5 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

13. How many complaints have been made against Trent Radio from the upstairs tenant, facility neighbours and the general Peterborough public? *(Reference: Report RF2)*

\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points for Physical Plant**

**Resources**

14. How inadequate is Trent Radio's provision of informational resources and/or aide in finding informational resources to help programmers, employees and volunteers? *(Reference: U1-10, E1-6 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

15. How user-unfriendly is Trent Radio's music archive online search portal? *(Reference: U1-11 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

16. How user-unfriendly and inaccessible is Trent Radio's vinyl collection? *(Reference: U1-12 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

17. How user-unfriendly is Trent Radio's digital music archive retrieval system? *(Reference: U1-13 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

18. How lacking in breadth and variety is the Trent Radio music archive (including vinyl and digital resources)? *(Reference: U1-14 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

**Failure Points**

- 19. How poorly does Trent Radio keep its music archive up-to-date and current? *(Reference: U1-15 [5 – Avg.]* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 20. How many groups, genres, or time frames have been ignored in the Trent Radio music archive, as expressed by the programmers? *(Reference: U1-16)* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 21. How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion for either an audio or informational resource in the period? *(Reference: U1-17 [5 – Avg.]* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 22. How poor is the “browsability” of the Trent Radio music archive? *(Reference: U1-18 [5 – Avg.]* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 23. How un-useful is the Trent Radio music archive? *(Reference: U1-19 [5 – Avg.]* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 24. How many programmers feel that Trent Radio needs to expand its spoken word archive? *(Reference: U1-20)* \_\_\_\_\_
  
- 25. Approximately what percentage of Trent Radio’s total audio collection is not currently accessible digitally? \_\_\_\_\_%  
*For each 5%, assign 1 Failure Point.* \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points for Resources**

---

Standards

**\*\*Refer to statistics maintained by Programme Director.**  
**Each “No” answer is equivalent to one Failure Point.**  
**These standards are those defined by Trent Radio, as those internally-produced standards exceed those of the CRTC.**

- 26. Has Trent Radio maintained a level of Spoken Word equivalent to or greater than 25% of all programming? Yes / No
  
  - 27. Has Trent Radio maintained a level of Pop/Rock/Dance music equivalent to or LESS than 40% of all music? Yes / No
  
  - 28. Has Trent Radio maintained a level of Traditional and Special Interest material equivalent to or greater than 5% of selections? Yes / No
  
  - 29. Has Trent Radio maintained a level of “Hits” played equivalent to or LESS than 5% of all music? Yes / No
-



30. Has Trent Radio broadcast a minimum of 42 hours of Station Produced material? Yes / No

31. Has Trent Radio broadcast less than 252 minutes of advertising and sponsorship? Yes / No

**Total Failure Points for Standards**

---

Equipment

**Failure Points**

32. How often has Trent Radio equipment failed within the period?  
(Reference: Report RF3) \_\_\_\_\_

33. How often have equipment failures resulted in over 10 minutes of dead air over both the radio broadcast and online stream? (Reference: Report RF3) \_\_\_\_\_

34. How user-unfriendly is Trent Radio equipment? (Reference: U1-21 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

35. How unfamiliar are programmers with the breadth of Trent Radio's audio equipment? (Reference: U1-22 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

36. How many programmers claim that Trent Radio's current equipment presents barriers to their ability to create the programs they envision? (Reference: U1-23) \_\_\_\_\_  
How many of these claims could be alleviated through more advanced and readily available technologies? \_\_\_\_\_

37. How many programmers do not feel that Trent Radio's equipment is technically adequate? (Reference: U1-24) \_\_\_\_\_

38. How un-useful do programmers find Trent Radio's equipment? (Reference: U1-25 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

39. How many times has the streaming technology failed in the past period? (Reference: Report R4) \_\_\_\_\_

40. How inadequate do employees of Trent Radio find the equipment (such as computers) towards completing their duties? (Reference E1-7 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points for Equipment**

---

**Total Failure Points:**

Accessibility

Physical Plant

Resources

Standards

Equipment

---

---

---

---

---

**Total**

---



**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Part II - Community Service Role Failure**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

For the period of: \_\_\_\_\_

*\*\*Those questions terminating with the expression "[5 - Avg.]" indicate that the Failure Point count shall be determined by averaging the results of all referenced forms and finding the difference between that average and the top rating (5).*

Concerning Programming...

**Failure Points**

1. How many instances of duplication in programming occurred this past season? (Reference: Form PD1-1.) \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many programmers failed to return this year, for reasons other than having moved out of town (that you know of)? (Reference: Form PD1-2.) \_\_\_\_\_

3. By how much did Trent Radio fail to at least meet the number of programmers it had in the previous period (if at all)? (Reference: Form PD1-3.) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Out all regularly-running programme proposals submitted, how many did not evolve into regular programmes? (Reference: Form PD1-4.) \_\_\_\_\_

5. How many interest areas or political/cultural ideas which were represented in the previous season are not being represented now? (Reference: Form PD1-5.) \_\_\_\_\_

6. According to the Programme Director, what percentage of programming in this period does not actively help Trent Radio achieve its aims? (Reference: Form PD1-6.) \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning Programming**

How Programmers See Trent Radio...

7. How poorly do the Programmers not know or understand the aims of Trent Radio? (Reference: Form U2-1 [5 - Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

**Failure Points**

8. How incompetent do Programmers feel Trent Radio staff are in operating a community radio station? *(Reference: Form U2-2 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

9. How many Programmers have not been asked for their input concerning Trent Radio's operations? *(Reference: Form U2-3.)*

\_\_\_\_\_

10. How uncomfortable do Programmers feel in trying to give feedback to Trent Radio about operations? *(Reference: Form U2-4 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

11. How poorly has Trent Radio taught Programmers about radio, technically and as an art or means of communication? *(Reference: Form U2-5 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How dissatisfied are Programmers with the existing means of receiving feedback from listeners? *(Reference: Form U2-6 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

13. How dissatisfied are Programmers with the feedback received from the Programme Director? *(Reference: Form U2-7 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

14. How many Programmers would like to receive the Programme Director's feedback more frequently? *(Reference: Form U2-8)*

\_\_\_\_\_

15. How poorly does Trent Radio support programme development? *(Reference: Form U2-9 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

16. How many Programmers do not feel that Trent Radio staff are truly there for them? *(Reference: Form U2-10)*

\_\_\_\_\_

17. By how much, on average, has Trent Radio failed to have a fully positive and enriching effect on its programmers? *(Reference: Form U2-11 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

18. How many Programmers have not yet been invited/encouraged to participate in Trent Radio in other ways? *(Reference: Form U2-12)*

\_\_\_\_\_

19. From the Programmer's perspective, how poor is the user-friendliness of the Trent Radio website? *(Reference: Form U2-13 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

20. From the Programmer's perspective, how useless is the Trent Radio website? *(Reference: Form U2-14 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Failure Points**

21. How ineffective to Programmers think Trent Radio is as a means for interacting with the Trent/Peterborough community? (Reference: Form U2-15 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

22. How many Programmers can *not* think of any examples of how community was fostered through their programme? (Reference: Form U2-16)

\_\_\_\_\_

23. How closed-off do Programmers perceive Trent Radio to be towards diverse political and/or cultural views/ideas? (Reference: Form U2-17 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

24. How many Programmers feel that Trent Radio does *not* do enough in terms of fostering its own community? (Reference: Form U2-18)

\_\_\_\_\_

25. How many Programmers do not feel that they will be returning to programming again at Trent Radio (for reasons other than moving away)? (Reference: Form U2-19)

\_\_\_\_\_

26. How uncomfortable were new Programmers made to feel at Trent Radio? (Reference: Form U2-20 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

27. How poorly do new Programmers rate Trent Radio's Studio A training? (Reference: Form U2-21 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

28. How poorly informed to new Programmers feel they are in terms of rules and the way things work? (Reference: Form U2-22 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

29. How many new Programmers are not familiar with all of the Trent Radio staff? (Reference: Form U2-23)

\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning How Programmers See Trent Radio**

Concerning Volunteer and Staff Satisfaction...

30. How unsatisfied do volunteers and staff feel at the end of the day? (Reference: Form E2-1 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

31. How anxious are volunteers and staff to get out? (Reference: Form E2-2 [5 – Avg.]

\_\_\_\_\_

**Failure Points**

32. How poorly has Trent Radio provided learning opportunities for its volunteers and staff? (Reference: Form E2-3 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

33. How poor is Trent Radio's potential for providing learning opportunities? (Reference: Form E2-4 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

34. How unsupportive is Trent Radio in helping volunteers and staff do the work asked of them? (Reference: Form E2-5 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

35. How insecure do volunteers and staff feel about Trent Radio's future? (Reference: Form E2-6 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

36. How much do volunteers and staff dislike the company of the people they work with, programmers or other volunteers and staff? (Reference: Form E2-7 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

37. How poor is Trent Radio in providing flexibility and support in working hours, personal emergencies, and stressful moments? (Reference: Form E2-8 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

38. How poor is Trent Radio at fostering community and allowing opportunities for its various members to socialize outside of the workplace/studio? (Reference: Form E2-9 [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

39. How poorly does Trent Radio handle internal conflicts? (Reference: Report CSR 1. [5 – Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Total Failure Points Concerning Volunteer and Staff Satisfaction**

**Total Failure Points:**  
Concerning Programming... \_\_\_\_\_  
How Programmers See Trent Radio... \_\_\_\_\_  
Concerning Employee/Volunteer Satisfaction... \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Total**

**Trent Radio Failure Summary**  
**Part III - Business/Operational Failure**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_\_\_

For the period of: \_\_\_\_\_

*\*\*Those questions terminating with the expression "[5 - Avg.]" indicate that the Failure Point count shall be determined by averaging the results of all referenced forms and finding the difference between that average and the top rating (5).*

Concerning the Board...

**Failure Points**

1. How many Board members from last year have failed to return this year, for internal reasons? (External reasons for leaving the Board would be moving, birth of a child, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

2. At any point during this year, were there less than seven (7) Directors to the Board? (Each Yes = 1 failure point) Yes / No

3. What was the maximum number by which the Board of Directors was short of having seven (7) members at any point in this period? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Was a majority of the members of the Board of Directors enrolled students of Trent University? (No = 1 failure point) Yes / No

5. How many meetings of the Board were subject to an unplanned cancellation (rather than postponement) in this past period for whatever reason(s)? \_\_\_\_\_

6. At how many meetings of the Board in this past period was quorum not reached? \_\_\_\_\_

7. How many Board members feel that a Board of seven (7) is not adequate / effective? (Reference: Form B1-1.) \_\_\_\_\_

8. How poorly do Board members feel that the provisions in Article III (Board of Directors) of Trent Radio By-Law No. 1 support the operations and best interests of the Board and Trent Radio? (Reference: Form B1-2 [5 - Avg.]) \_\_\_\_\_

---



**Failure Points**

9. How poorly do Board members feel that they have been prepared / trained / informed on how to perform their duties and be a part of the Board of Directors for Trent Radio? *(Reference: Form B1-3 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

10. How poorly do Board members feel that their fellow Board members have been prepared / trained / informed on how to perform their duties and be a part of the Board of Directors for Trent Radio? *(Reference: Form B1-4 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

11. How poorly informed do Board members feel they are before meetings to discuss and make votes on the decisions at hand? *(Reference: Form B1-5 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How poor are current means and channels of communication to Board members? *(Reference: Form B1-6 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

13. How poorly-chosen are topics for board development sessions according to Board members? *(Reference: Form B1-7 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

14. How unprepared and ineffective are board development sessions, according to Board members? *(Reference: Form B1-8 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

15. How many Board members feel that the current frequency of Board meetings is inappropriate and ineffective? *(Reference: Form B1-9)*

\_\_\_\_\_

16. According to Board members, how ineffective are meetings of the Board? *(Reference: Form B1-10 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

17. According to Board members, how poor is the quality of the discussion which takes place at Board meetings? *(Reference: Form B1-11 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

18. According to Board members, how poor is the current Board make-up, in terms of members who represent and exhibit a diversity of ideas and are supportive of constructive conversation? *(Reference: Form B1-12 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

19. How unconfident are Directors that their decisions will actually be implemented? *(Reference: Form B1-13 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

20. How poor does the Board itself feel that its follow-up on its own decisions is? *(Reference: Form B1-14 [5 – Avg.]*)

\_\_\_\_\_

---

**Failure Points**

21. How stressful do Board members find their positions? *(Reference: Form B1-15)*

\_\_\_\_\_

22. How poor does the Board feel it has been this period at reasonable and measurable goal-setting? *(Reference: Form B1-16 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

23. How poorly do Board members feel that the current informal/ad-hoc committee structure/system adequately addresses and supports the operations of Trent Radio and the decisions of the Board? *(Reference: Form B1-17 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

24. How closed-off did this period’s new Board members feel during their first meetings and activities? *(Reference: Form B1-18 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

25. How inadequate does the Board feel it is at recognizing when it needs or could benefit from external advice? *(Reference: Form B1-19 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

26. How many Board members feel that it is not always clear who is responsible for what? *(Reference: Form B1-20 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

27. On average, how poorly does the timing of meetings work for the Board members? *(Reference: Form B1-21 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

28. How inadequate do Board members find the meeting space? *(Reference: Form B1-22 [5 – Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

29. How many Board members have noticed the following symptoms of groupthink in the past period *(Reference: Form B1-23):*

- Sense of invincibility (excessive optimism and risk-taking)
- Collective rationalization
- Stereotyping of “enemies”
- Pressure against dissent of opinion

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

30. How many Board members would not like to continue in the coming season? *(Reference: Form B1-24)*

\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning the Board**

\_\_\_\_\_

Concerning Programmers...

**Failure Points**

31. How inadequate do programmers feel that the current means and channels of communication are? *(Reference: Form U3-1 [5 - Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

32. How many programmers do not feel that Trent Radio is adequately staffed to get things done and done properly? *(Reference: Form U3-2)*

\_\_\_\_\_

33. How troublesome did programmers find the program proposal process? *(Reference: Form U3-3 [5 - Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

34. How many programmers feel that Trent Radio takes too much time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts? *(Reference: Form U3-4)*

\_\_\_\_\_

35. How many programmers feel that Trent Radio does not take enough time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts? *(Reference: Form U3-5)*

\_\_\_\_\_

36. How many non-Trent student programmers feel that their membership fee is unreasonable? *(Reference: Form U3-6)*

\_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning Programmers**

Concerning Volunteers and Staff...

37. How poor do volunteers and staff feel that Trent Radio is for keeping them up to date and informed about what's going on and the decisions made by the Board? *(Reference: Form E3-1 [5-Avg.]*

\_\_\_\_\_

38. How stressed out do volunteers and staff feel due to what they perceive to be faulty, inefficient and/or nonsensical operations at Trent Radio? *(Reference: Form E3-2, Avg.)*

\_\_\_\_\_

39. How many volunteers and staff do not feel that they are being given enough time at the beginning of the year to get things up and running before the regular season starts? *(Reference: Form E3-3)*

\_\_\_\_\_

40. How poorly do volunteers and staff feel that the work they do connects to the aims of Trent Radio? *(Reference: Form E3-4)*

\_\_\_\_\_

41. How many duties altogether do volunteers / staff feel they are unable to pay due attention to due to needs in other areas? *(Reference: Form E3-5)*

\_\_\_\_\_

**Failure Points**

42. How unclear do volunteers and staff find roles and responsibilities at Trent Radio? *(Reference: Form E3-6 [5 – Avg.]*) \_\_\_\_\_

43. How many volunteers and staff members feel that they do not have enough authority and empowerment to do their work efficiently and independently? *(Reference: Form E3-7)* \_\_\_\_\_

44. How many volunteers and staff members feel that they are not adequately compensated for the work they do (taking into consideration Trent Radio’s financial constraints)? *(Form E3-8)* \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning Volunteers and Staff**

Concerning Reports of the AGM – General

45. Review the reports from the previous year’s AGM. List the goals and objectives set out in all reports and documents, including but not limited to the Sponsorship Report, the Fundraising Report, the Production Manager’s Report, the Programme Director’s Report, and the General Manager’s Report.

How many of these goals were not met in the course of this past fiscal year, as set out in the preceding AGM? \_\_\_\_\_

46. How many objectives set out by the Board throughout this year (at regular meetings of the Board) were not completed by the desired deadline? \_\_\_\_\_

47. How many planned events did not occur or had to be diminished in scope throughout the course of this year? \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Failure Points Concerning Reports of the AGM - General**

Concerning Reports of the AGM – Financial

48. How many fewer sponsors were secured this year compared to the previous year? *(0 if more secured this year than previously.)* \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Failure Points**

49. If total Sponsorship Funding secured this year was less than that secured in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{SF this year} \div \text{SF in previous year} \times 10$$

(where SF stands for Sponsorship Funding in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Sponsorship Funding compared to previous year.)*

50. If total Corporate Donations acquired this year was less than that acquired in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{CD this year} \div \text{CD in previous year} \times 10$$

(where CD stands for Corporate Donations in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Corporate Donations compared to previous year.)*

51. If total Private Donations acquired this year was less than that acquired in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{PD this year} \div \text{PD in previous year} \times 10$$

(where PD stands for Private Donations in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Private Donations compared to previous year.)*

52. How many fewer Community Memberships were acquired this year compared to last year? *(0 if more acquired this year.)*

---

53. If Special Events Fundraising yielded less this year than in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{SEF this year} \div \text{SEF in previous year} \times 10$$

(where SEF stands for Special Events Fundraising yield in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Special Events Fundraising yield compared to previous year.)*

---

**Failure Points**

54. If General Fundraising (Trent Radio paraphernalia) yielded less this year than in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{GF this year} \div \text{GF in previous year} \times 10$$

(where GF stands for General Fundraising yield in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in General Fundraising yield compared to previous year.)*

55. If Net Earned Revenue yielded less this year than in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{ER this year} \div \text{ER in previous year} \times 10$$

(where ER stands for Net Earned Revenue yield in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Net Earned Revenue yield compared to previous year.)*

56. If grants yielded less this year than in the previous year, calculate:

$$\text{G this year} \div \text{G in previous year} \times 10$$

(where G stands for grants yield in dollars)

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in grants yield compared to previous year.)*

57. If a levy increase was sought in this period, assign a number of failure points equivalent to the percentage of Trent Students who expressed opposition to the levy increase, regardless of whether or not a levy increase was secured.

---

58. If Actual Revenues for the period were less than Projected Revenues (as outlined in the most recent revision of the Budget), calculate:

$$\text{Actual Revenues} \div \text{Projected Revenues} \times 10$$

---

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% shortage in Actual Revenue compared to Projected Revenue.)*

---

59. If Actual Expenses for the period were more than Project Expenses (as outlined in the most recent revision of the Budget), calculate:

$$\text{Actual Expenses} \div \text{Projected Expenses} \times 10 \quad \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

Assign the product as failure points. *(One failure point per 10% excess in Actual Expenses compared to Projected Expenses.)*

**Total Failure Points Concerning Reports of the AGM - Financial**

**Total Failure Points**

	<b>Failure Points</b>
Concerning the Board...	<u>                    </u>
Concerning Programmers...	<u>                    </u>
Concerning Volunteers and Staff...	<u>                    </u>
Concerning Reports of the AGM – General	<u>                    </u>
Concerning Reports of the AGM – Financial	<u>                    </u>

**Total**

**Trent Radio Indicators of Failure  
Report of the Results  
By Lily J. Mills  
For: John K. Muir, Trent Radio  
And Professor R. Dart, Trent University  
April 9, 2007**

**Overview**

The following report gives an interpretation of the results of the Indicators of Failure evaluation process implemented within Trent Radio for the 2006-2007 season.

The following aspects of the evaluation are discussed:

- Methodology of Evaluation;
- Incomplete Aspects of Evaluation;
- Failures of Note: Radio Facility Failure;
- Failures of Note: Community Service Role Failure;
- Failures of Note: Business/Operational Failure;
- A General Suggestion;
- General Observations of the Evaluation Process;
- Conclusion;
- Appendices.

The interpretations herein provided are merely a stepping stone towards positive change away from failure at Trent Radio. Further questioning should be completed for full understanding of the hard data results of the surveys in order to identify specific reasons behind failures. Consequently, core problems can be identified and plans for change implemented.



## **Methodology of Evaluation**

The information which comprises the various identified indicators stemmed from a number of sources, including reports from Annual General Meetings and the direct questioning of Trent Radio staff. A majority of the indicators have been yielded through a comprehensive survey process which sought the feedback of Programmers, Volunteers, Staff and Board members.

Survey questions generally took on one of three forms. Those requiring Yes/No answers were typically phrased such that a “Yes” response would be positive and therefore a “No” response would result in a Failure Point for Trent Radio. Some responses required a quantity (i.e., “How many times...”) and were phrased such that the optimal answer would be zero, and thus any response of 1 or more resulted in Failure Points.

The third and most common type of survey question involved opinion-based rating. Respondents were asked to rate a particular service or experience at Trent Radio on a scale of 1-5, 1 generally being equivalent to “very bad” and 5 being equivalent to “excellent.” In the calculation of Failure Points for such questions, the results were tabulated on an Excel page, their average for each question calculated, and the difference between the positive average and 5 (that being considered perfection) calculated. This difference represented the Failure Points for the issue concerned. Generally for these reverse-average Failure Point calculations, results were under “2.” The failures noted herein are for the exceptionalities, those questions which received reverse averages of 2 or greater.

Part I of the evaluation, Radio Facility Failure, some Failure Points were

calculated from the responses of both surveys given to Programmers and Volunteers/Staff (the two groups received different surveys reflected the different concerns for each). At times, concerns spanned both groups, such as level of comfort in the Trent Radio facility. In these instances, the reverse averages from each group of respondents was found, and the average between these reverse averages was calculated, constituting the combined Failure Point level for the issue (again most often being below the count of “2”).

It should be noted that the surveys were conducted on paper or in MSWord format (respondents were given both options, although e-response did not ensure anonymity). This form of survey allowed respondents greater flexibility in their answers, which was often harnessed. Some answers were given in half points (i.e., 3.5), some answers received worded responses (“maybe” or “don’t know”), and some received extra punctuation (“5!” or “☺”). For rating systems, respondents either gave numbers or “don’t know” responses, but with Yes/No questions, if a respondent answered “maybe” or “sometimes,” then the response was considered to carry a 0.5 Failure Point. It would be encouraged that Trent Radio maintain the flexible response survey style in order to glean the most informative responses from respondents, even if those responses cannot at all times be translated into calculable Failure Points.

### **Incomplete Calculations**

A number of Failure Point measures were not calculated for this term, largely due to the fact that this framework has only recently been developed. The following measures require that tracking be done throughout the regular operating year and would be implemented for the first time in the coming year, 2007-2008:

### Radio Facility Failure

- 1. How often in this period have scheduling problems remained unresolved?  
*(Reference: Report RF5);*
- 10. How often in this period have Trent Radio employees, volunteers, and programmers suffered a loss of physical or digital files due to improper or insecure storage? *(Reference: Report RF1);*
- 13. How many complaints have been made against Trent Radio from the upstairs tenant, facility neighbours and the general Peterborough public? *(Reference: Report RF2);*
- 32. How often has Trent Radio equipment failed within the period? *(Reference: Report RF3);*
- 33. How often have equipment failures resulted in over 10 minutes of dead air over both the radio broadcast and online stream? *(Reference: Report RF3);*
- 39. How many times has the streaming technology failed in the past period?  
*(Reference: Report R4).*

### Community Service Role Failure

- 39. How poorly does Trent Radio handle internal conflicts? *(Reference: Report CSR 1. [5 – Avg.]).*

### Business Failure

Measurements which were not able to be taken for this period under the Business/Operational Failure component of the evaluation were those requiring response from Board members (Questions 7 through 30) as well as those requiring budgeted

figures (Questions 58 and 59). Given the Governing (i.e., non-working) nature of the Board, it was difficult to obtain Board responses via paper surveys. MSWord document surveys were proliferated to Board members, but only was completed survey was returned. One member's opinion is not sufficient to truly represent the opinions of the Board members in general, and therefore these measurements have been negated for this term. The Questions dealing with budget figures cannot be answered because Trent Radio does not establish a budget for itself; however, these questions will remain in the evaluation format in case Trent Radio ever decides to do so.

**Failures of Note: Radio Facility Failure**

**Total Failure Points:**

	<b>Failure Points</b>
Accessibility	10.8
Physical Plant	16.2
Resources	39.8
Standards	0
Equipment	7.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>74.5</b>

**\*\*Note:** Separate aspects of each failure type (i.e., Accessibility, Physical Plant, etc.) can not be inter-compared. Levels of Failure Points for each are not relative.

- Question 5 – Adequate Training and Support: Programmers collectively claimed 14.5 incidents of not having received proper training with Trent Radio equipment. This inadequate training may apply to any aspect of the Trent Radio equipment.
- Question 5 (accidentally duplicated) – Adequacy of Working Spaces: Input for this assessment was gathered from Programmers, Staff, and Volunteers. Although

the combined reverse average was less than 2, it should be noted that three respondents noted that the environment tends to be cold/chilly.

- Questions 6 and 8 – Physical Storage Space Provisions: 5 Programmers and 3 Staff/Volunteers expressed dissatisfaction with storage provisions.

- Question 11 – Physical Barriers: Three respondents experienced the physical barrier of being locked out of the building. One respondent gave the following note:

My vision isn't great, and the labeling of electronics is generally horrible. It would be great to consider interfaces when purchasing new equipment. And it's too cold. And the benches are too hard.

- Question 17 – Digital Music Archive Usability: Trent Radio received a reverse average rating of 2.3 for the user-friendliness of its digital music archive retrieval system.
- Question 19 – Current Status of Music Archive: Although this rating was under 2 (standing at 1.9), it should be mentioned that one respondent asked, “Why no earshot charts?”
- Question 20 – Underrepresented Aspects of Music Archive: 8 genres/groups/time frames were identified as being ignored in the music archive.
  - Loud rock;
  - Electronic music;
  - Canadian comedy;
  - Blues (“the jazz collection is mostly crap fusion and any album that has a black guy on the cover and is not rap is considered jazz”);
  - Industrial electronica ebm eurodance;

- Weird Al;
- Conservatives (?); and,
- Slam Poetry.
- Also mentioned was the date “February 22, 1963” was also listed; however, this response is most likely poking fun at the reference to a neglected “time frame” in the original survey question. (The only significance of this date seems to be Vijay Singh’s birthday.)
- Question 22 – Music Archive Browsability: Trent Radio received a 2.6 reverse average rating for the “browsability” of the music archive.
- Question 24 – Spoken Word Archive: 13 Programmers feel that Trent Radio should expand its spoken word archive.
- Question 36 – Equipment Barriers: 4 Programmers stated that Trent Radio’s current equipment presents barriers to their ability to create the programs they envisioned, with the following 5 reasons:
  - Absence of CD mixer;
  - Absence of 2 tape recorders;
  - Needles in record players not always functional;
  - Need for better headphones (Respondent suggestion: Maybe have a sign-up sheet to guarantee safety?); and,
  - Mic stands are rickety.
  - Also mentioned was the inability for full bands to play live sets (“...which is extremely lame”); however, this inadequacy was not counted for a Failure Point as it could not be alleviated through more advanced and

readily available technologies. This capacity may more likely represent a long-term goal if deemed integral.

**Failures of Note: Community Service Role Failure**

**Total Failure Points:**

	<b>Failure Points</b>
Concerning Programming...	13
How Programmers See Trent Radio...	57.1
Concerning Employee/Volunteer Satisfaction...	4.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>74.8</b>

---

- Question 2 – Non-Returning Programmers: 9 Programmers from the 2005-2006 season did not return to Trent Radio for this season for reasons other than having moved out of town.
- Question 9 – Appeals for Input: 5 Programmers stated that they had not before been asked for their input concerning Trent Radio’s operations (this failure may in fact be remedied through these very surveys, of course).
- Question 14 – Programme Director Feedback: 10 Programmers state that they would like to receive the Programme Director’s feedback more often; however, two did note that they understand the constraints which may not make this possible.
- Question 18 – Extension in Participation: A non-calculated sub-question (under Question 12 of Form U2) showed that 4 individuals at Trent Radio would be interested in a greater level of participation (i.e., through participation with the Board, volunteering, etc.).

- Question 19 – Website User-Friendliness: Trent Radio’s website received a reverse average rating of 2.4 for the user-friendliness of its website.
- Question 20 – Website Usefulness: Trent Radio’s website received a reverse average rating of 2 for the usefulness of its website.
- Question 24 – Fostering the Trent Radio Community: 6.5 Programmers feel that Trent Radios does not do enough in terms of fostering its own community (a half count results from the response “sort of.”). One Programmer suggested that Trent Radio hold a Programmer Meet and Greet.
- Question 29 – New Programmers and Staff: 4.5 new Programmers state that they are not familiar with all of the Trent Radio Staff (a half count results from the response “most”).

**Failures of Note: Business/Operational Failure**

**Total Failure Points**

	<b>Failure Points</b>
Concerning the Board...	5
Concerning Programmers...	3.2
Concerning Volunteers and Staff...	21.5
Concerning Reports of the AGM – General	3
Concerning Reports of the AGM – Financial	3
	<hr/>

**Total**

---

- Question 33 – Programme Proposal Process: Given that the evaluation is meant to focus on failures, this note is the only one which will address a success. Because of exceptional ratings in general, plus one rating of 8 (on a scale of 1-5), Trent Radio received a reverse average rating of -0.1 for the ease of its programme proposal process!



- Questions 34 and 39 – Pre-Season Preparation: While 2 Programmers felt that Trent Radio takes too much time at the beginning of the season to get things up and running, 3 Staff/Volunteers felt that they did not have enough time (one noting, “Is there such a thing?”). This issue would hence have to be one of compromise in order to address the needs of both parties, whose interests appear contradictory in this case.
- Question 38 – Volunteer/Staff Stress Levels: Volunteers and Staff expressed reverse average rating of 2.9 for their level of stress due to what they perceive to be faulty, inefficient and/or nonsensical operations at Trent Radio.
- Question 41 – Neglected Duties: Altogether, Volunteers and Staff feel that they are unable to address 12 of their consummate duties adequately due to needs in other areas of their portfolios.
- Question 50 – Corporate Donations: Trent Radio secured 100% less in Corporate Donations for the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 51 – Private Donations: Trent Radio secured 45% less in Private Donations for the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 53 – Special Events Fundraising: Trent Radio secured 56% less through Special Events Fundraising in the 2006 fiscal year compared to the 2005 fiscal year.
- Question 57 – The Levy Question: 9.1% of full-time undergrad Trent students expressed opposition to the levy increase.

**A General Suggestion**

The following concerns were forwarded to the evaluation facilitator:

If you are looking for suggestions to help [Trent Radio] I think having the website overhauled, like having Indie Charts. I know starting our own charts won't be easy, but they seem to garner a lot of interest on other stations such as LU Radio and CIUT, as well as possibly a digital signal I think that's what it's called;) Oh and maybe a promotional campaign - massive postering and getting some spots in local newspapers might help, as well as making [Trent Radio] nights such as the Monday nights at Sadlier house more public by postering the event in the city.

### **General Observations of the Evaluation Process**

- Question 3 of Form U1 (After your initial training, how adequate was continued support and guidance in the use of equipment?) issued one response of “Fuck you.” This defensiveness may indicate a sense of pride about Trent Radio, one which even extends to the Programmers (as Form U1 was one completed by Programmers), which has both benefits and shortcomings.
- It seemed that some Programmers had trouble answering Questions 11-18 of Form U1:
  - Question 11: How user-friendly is Trent Radio’s music archive online search portal?
  - Question 12: How user-friendly and easily accessible is Trent Radio’s vinyl collection?
  - Question 13: How user-friendly is Trent Radio’s digital music archive retrieval system?
  - Question 14: How would you rate the breadth and variety of the Trent Radio music archive (including vinyl and digital resources)?
  - Question 15: How well does Trent Radio keep its music archive up-to-date and current?

- Question 16: Do you feel that any particular group, genre, or time frame has been ignored in the Trent Radio music archive?
- Question 17: How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion for either an audio or informational resource in the period?
- Question 18: How would you rate the “browsability” of the Trent Radio music archive?

All of these questions deal with the Trent Radio music archive (except Question 17, which should thus perhaps be moved to exchange survey positioning with Question 18). About one-third of responses to these questions expressed confusion or non-applicability to the respondents (i.e. “I don’t know” or “I don’t use this”). At the same time, many Programmers did respond to the questions with numerical levels. Thus, while these questions should in fact remain part of the evaluation, it should be expected that not all Programmers will be able to respond, as they do not all use the music archive.

Of particular note was Question 15, which showed an increase of non-committal responses. As such, Question 15 may be removed, as Question 25 of Part I – Radio Facility Failure addresses the success/failure of Trent Radio’s ability to keep its archive/collection up-to-date.

Question 17 may have been confusing because it did not refer specifically to suggestions made by the respondent and should be restated as “How many times has Trent Radio failed to follow-up on a suggestion you have made for either an audio or informational resource in the period? *(N/A if no such suggestions have been made)*”

- Question 3 of Form U2 (“Has Trent Radio ever asked for your input concerning their operations?”) would be redundant as the surveys are themselves in fact asking for the Programmer’s input. This question will likely be removed.
- One respondent was confused about to whom Question 7 of Form U2 (“How satisfied are you with the feedback you receive from the Programme Director?”) was referring. Laurel’s name will be added to the survey and changed as necessary.
- To Question 10 of Form U2 (Are you made to feel that the Trent Radio staff are truly there for you (the programmers)?), one respondent stated “weird question.” This question could be restated to perhaps make more sense: “Are you made to feel that the Trent Radio staff are truly there to serve your interests rather than their own ideas?”
- There seemed to be some confusion over the juxtaposition of Questions 4 and 5 in Form U3 (“Do you think that Trent Radio takes too much time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts?” and “Do you think that Trent Radio takes enough time to get up and running in their regular season after the school year starts?”) Perhaps these questions should be amalgamated to ask both questions simultaneously.
- It seems that Question 8 of Form E3 (“Do you feel that you are adequately compensated for the work you do (taking into consideration Trent Radio’s financial constraints)?”) may be too sensitive an issue. 3 respondents answered “Yes” while 2 left the response blank. This question may be removed from the form.

- The equations provided for the calculation of Failure Points in dealing with Financial Reports at the AGM are flawed. Rather than dividing the current figure by the previous figure, the difference between the two (assuming the current figure is lower) should be the amount which is divided by the figure from the previous fiscal year (and subsequently multiplied by 10).
- The Radio Facility Failure Assessment form has two questions labeled as Question 5. Number throughout will have to be adjusted.
- Upon actually doing the tabulations, it was discovered that it would facilitate the process if boxes were framing the spaces where sub-totals are calculated, as has been done in pencil on the current assessment forms.

### **Conclusion**

Through the creation and implementation of this evaluation process, I have hoped to help Trent Radio identify its failures. Finding these failures is only half the battle, however. There are reasons behind these failures, reasons which have not necessarily been identified through this process. Furthermore, priorities and possibilities must be set. The Indicators of Failure do just that – merely indicate. It is the initial development towards change, as well as a useful and standardized instrument to show Volunteers, Staff, and Programmers that their opinions matter and that they can inspire change.

### **Appendices**

- Tabulations of responses for Forms U1, U2, U3, E1, E2, and E3. *(Questions are not included, thus cross-referencing of questions will be required with original forms when reading tabulations.)*

## Tabulation of Responses - Form U1 -

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7
	5	pretty good	fine		(crossed out)	N	N
	5	too long ago :)		4 none		2 N	N
	4		4	4 n/a		5 Y	N
	5		5	5 never		5 N	N
	5		4	4 nope		3.5 N	N
	5		3	5	2	2 Y	N
	3		3	2	0	1 Y	N
	5		2	2	0	2.5 n/a	n/a
	3.5		5	5	2	4	
	5	3.5	4	0	3.5	N	N
	5	5	5	5	4	N	N
	4.5	4	5	0	4	N	N
	4	4	5	1	4	N	Y
	5	4	4	0	2	Y	N
	4	4	4	1.5	4	Y	N
	5	2	3	0	4	N	N
	5	3	5	0	1	N	N
	2	4	4	0	3.5	N	N
	5	5	5	1	4	N	N
	5	4	5	0	3	N	N
	5	3	3	1	3	N	N
	5	3.5	2.5	0	5	N	N
	5	3.5	4	0	3.5	N	N
	4	2	3	1	2	N	N
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.54</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>4.02</b>		<b>3.28</b>		
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>1.72</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
		*overwhelming	*fuck-yu		*cold		
					*chilly		
					*too cold		

## Tabulation of Responses - Form U1 -

	Q.8	Q.9	Q.10	Q.11	Q.12
N			fine, I guess	que?	pretty good, though haphazard
N		5			don't use it
N		2			
N		5	5		
N		4	4	don't use it	n/a
N		5	2	don't know	?
N		5	1	n/a	don't know
N		4	1	1.5	3
		5	4	4	4
N		5	3	5	2
N		5	5	8	4
N		5	5	5	5
N		5	4	5	3
N		5	3	2	4
N		4	3	2	4
Y - locked out		5	1	2	5
Y		3	4	1	1
N		4	3.5	3	2
N		5	4	3	3
N		3	3	2	1
N		5	3	3	5
N		5	3	3	3
N		3.5	3.5	3	3.5
N		4	2	1	2
<b>Average</b>		4.41	3.19	3.15	3.21
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	2	0.59	1.81	1.85	1.79
		*perfect!			
		*5!			

## Tabulation of Responses - Form U1 -

	Q.13	Q.14	Q.15	Q.16	Q.17
	pretty brutal	I like it.	I don't know	N	0
	don't use it		don't know	N	?
		? Seems good		Y	what?
	n/a	n/a	?	N	0
	don't know	unknown	n/a	N	0
	2	too new	don't know	Y	
	2.5	3.5	unknown	don't know	
	4	5	? Don't know		
	5	5	4	not sure, don't think so	None with me
	5	5	3	Y	None
	4	4	3.5	Y	never
	2	3	3	Y	?
	3	4	3	Y	0
	4	4	2	Y	(crossed out)
	1	5	1	rarely use	don't know
	1	3	1	?	0
	3	3	3.5		?
	3	4	4	N	0
	1	3	3	Y	none
	3	1	5	N	don't know
	1	2	3	Y	?
	3	4	4	N	0
	1	5	4	N	0
<b>Average</b>	2.69	3.74	3.13		
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	2.31	1.26	1.87	8	0
	* need access before shows		*3, but that's ok		



## Tabulation of Responses - Form U1 -

	Q.18	Q.19	Q.20	Q.21	Q.22	Q.23	Q.24
	brutal	useless to me	Y			N	Y
	don't use this	don't use this	Y			N	Y
					5		
		(crossed out)	Y	5	4.5	N	Y
	(crossed out)		N	4	3	N	Y
			Y	3	4	N	Y
	?	1	N	3	3	Y	N
		2	Y	3.5	2	N	unsure
	5	4		4	2		
	3	5	in between	5	3	N	Y
	5	5	N	5	4	Y	Y
	4	4.73	N	5	4	N	Y
	3	3	N	4	4	N	Y
	0	2	N	5	3	N	Y
	4	5	Y	4	3	Y	Y
	0	3	Y	5	4	N	Y
	0	2	Y	2	2	N	Y
	1	3.5	Y	4	3.5	N	Y
	3.5	4	N	5	4	N	Y
	3.5	2	N	4	5	N	Y
	3	3	N	3	2	don't know	Y, don't know
	1	2	Y	3.5	3	Y	Y
	1	3	Y	4	3	N	Y
	2	2	Y	4	4	N	Y
<b>Average</b>	2.44	3.12		4.05	3.41		
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	2.56	1.88	13	0.95	1.59	4	1

**Tabulation of Responses  
- Form U1 -**

	<b>Q.25</b>
	pardon?
	4
	4
	2
	5
	5
	4
	5
	4.2222
	5
	4
	4
	3
	2
	4
	4
	4
	3
	3.5
	4
	5
<b>Average</b>	3.94
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	1.06
	*fine, 3
	*3.5 :)



## Tabulation of Responses - Form U2 -

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7
		4	not sure	3	2	3	Who? Loral? Very.
	3	4	N	3	4	3	4
	5	5	Y	5	5	5	5
	2.5	4	in between	3	2.5	5	1
	3	5	Y	5	4	3	4
	4	5	N	4	5	2	3
	2	2	N	4	3	2	2
	3	5	Y	5	4	5	2.5
	5	3.5	N	1.5	3	4	1
	5	5		5	4	5	5
	4	5	Y	3	3	1	4
	3.5	5		5	4.5	4	2.5
	3	4.5	Y	4	3.5	4	4
	4	5	Y	5	5	4	5
	2	3	N	2	2	1	1
<b>Average</b>	3.50	4.38		3.88	3.63	3.40	3.14
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	1.50	0.67	5	0.17	1.67	1.60	1.86



## Tabulation of Responses - Form U2 -

	Q.8	Q.9	Q.10	Q.11	Q.12
	Y	pretty well	some		sort of
	N	4	Y	4	Y*
	Y	5	Y	5	Y
	N	1	weird question	3.5	Y*
	Y	5	Y	5	Y
	Y	4	Y	5	Y
	Y	2	N	5	N
	Y, but understand constraints	3	Y	5	Y
	Y	1	N	5	N*
	Y	4	Y	5	don't know*
	N	4	Y	5	Y
	Y, but understand constraints	3.5	Y	5	Y
	N	4	Y	5.5	Y
	N	3	Y	5	Y*
	Y	2	Y	5	N
<b>Average</b>					
<b>Rev. A</b>		10	5	2.5	3.5
				*5!	



**Tabulation of Responses**  
**- Form U2 -**

	<b>Q.13</b>	<b>Q.14</b>	<b>Q.15</b>	<b>Q.16</b>
	not very, but I like it	gave my email to spammers	perception vs. reality?	N
	don't know	don't know		4 Y
	2	3		4 Y
	2.5	2.5		3 Y
	4	5		4 Y
	3	3		4 Y
	3	3		2 N
	3	4.5		3 Y
	2	2		5 N
	4	4.5		3 Y
	0	0		4 N
	3.5	3.5		3 Y
	2	2		4 Y
	3	4		5 Y
	2	2		1 Y
<b>Average</b>	2.62	3.00	3.50	
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	2.38	2.00	1.50	4



**Tabulation of Responses  
- Form U2 -**

	Q.17	Q.18	Q.19	Q.20	Q.21	Q.22	Q.23
	4	sort of	maybe	depends	1.5	2.5	most
	4	Y	Y				
	5	Y	Y				
	5	Y	Y	4	5	5 I think	N
	5	Y	Y	5	4	4	Y
	4	N	Y				
	3	N	N	4	3	4	Y
	5	N	Y	4	5	4	N, not all
	5	N	Y				
	5	Y	Y				
	5	N	Y				
	5	Y	Y	4.5	4	3.5	N
	5	Y	Y	4	3.5	4	Y
	5	N	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	Y
	3	Y	Y	3	1	1	N
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.53</b>			<b>4.07</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>3.50</b>	
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>4.5</b>

**Tabulation of Responses**  
**- Unit U3 -**

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6
	4 Y		4 N	Y	Y	
	3.712946	can't tell	8	don't know	???	Y
	5 Y		5 Y	what?	(crossed)	
	4 Y		5 N	Y	Y	
	2.5 Y		4 N	Y	Y	
	3 Y		5 Y	Y	Y	
	4 Y		5 N	Y	Y	
<b>Average</b>	3.744707		5.142857			
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	1.255293	0	-0.142857	2	0	0



**Tabulation of Responses**  
**- Form E1 -**

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7
	3	N	N	N	4	what?	4
	5	N	N	N	5	5	5
	5	N	N	N	5	3	5
	3.5	Y	N	N	4	3.5	4
	3	N	N	Y - locked doors!	5	3	5
	2	Y	N	N	5	3	2
	5	N	N	N	5	4	5
	4	N	N	N	5	5	5
	4	N	Y	N	5	4	4
	1	N	N	Y	2	3	4
	3	Y	N	N	4	4	4
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.5</b>				<b>4.45</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>4.27</b>
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>0.73</b>



## Tabulation of Responses - Form E2 -

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7	Q.8
	differs	4	4	4	4	3	4	5
	4	5	5	5	4	5	3	5
	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4	3	5	5
	3	4	4	4	4	5	5	4
	4	3.5	5	5	5	5	8	5
<b>Average</b>	4.1	4.333333	4.583333	4.583333	4.333333	4.333333	5	4.8
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	0.9	0.666667	0.416667	0.416667	0.666667	0.666667	0	0.2
		*3.5, depends				*3-infinity		

**Tabulation of Responses**  
**- Form E2 -**

	0.9
	4
	4
	5
	3.6
	4
	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.266667</b>
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	<b>0.733333</b>

## Tabulation of Responses - Form E3 -

	Q.1	Q.2	Q.3	Q.4	Q.5	Q.6	Q.7	Q.8
	4	3	N	5	n/a	3	Y	
	3	3	Y	4	5	2	Y	Y
	4	2	N, is there	4	2	3	Y	Y
	5	3.25	Y	3.75	0	4.5	Y	Y
	4	3	N	5	5	3	Y	
<b>Average</b>	4			4.35		3.1		
<b>Rev. Av.</b>	1	2.85	3	0.65	12	1.9	0	0





## **Organizational Assessment Methods for Trent Radio**

By Lily J. Mills

Date: Feb. 04, 2007

For ADMN

Supervising Professor: R. Dart

### **Introduction**

Marvin Everett Mundel defines improvement as “bringing into a more desirable state” (1). This definition implies that improvement is only possible when the current conditions of an entity leave something to be desired, and rightly so. At organizations like Trent Radio, a community radio facility, improvement is always possible.

The inability of Trent Radio to reach a state of perfection stems from its highly abstract and varied aims, which emphasize community-building and interaction; the inspiration of creativity; the maximization of diversity; encouragement of the use of radio; and fair and efficient operations. Despite the fact that there is no terminal and measurable point of completion for such objectives, Trent Radio seeks to improve, to bring itself into a more desirable state. It is for this purpose that an organizational assessment model is to be developed and implemented.

Organizational assessments in practice often focus on matters of productivity and performance (Van de Ven 1), such as number of vehicles made within a week or number of customers served in an hour. Unfortunately, such basic counting assessments will only serve very specific, although important, aspects of Trent Radio’s operations. For example, it would be excessively difficult to try to track how many times the facility brought about community-building and interaction. Even when such counts are relatively simple, such as how many community members felt encouraged and compelled to use the

facility in a given season, the potential of these aims to be fulfilled will never conceivably be fulfilled and therefore will always be subject to improvement.

In order to improve, therefore, Trent Radio seeks to discover how current operations and internal culture are imperfect. This perceived desire to identify imperfections has inspired the conceptual framework of “Key Indicators of Failure.” The assessment seeks to quantify Trent Radio’s operations and intangible products in order to measure distance from perfection. This approach could be likened to a teacher delivering a report card showing only those grades below an A, so that the student concentrates on areas needing improvement rather than gloating in successes.

To state a desire to measure distance from perfection, there lies an assumption that perfection itself has a number or measurable level. At the same time, it has already been stated that perfection for Trent Radio is inconceivable and impossible. Therefore, it is not directly these aims which are to be measured in terms of failure, but those elements of Trent Radio which contribute towards their achievement. Such a deconstruction of the organization shall require a thorough analysis and discovery of these contributing factors, be they technical, cultural, political, financial, operational, logical, illogical or relating to anything else which adds to the composition of Trent Radio. Subsequently, perfection levels for these manageable elements will be defined (rather than goals, which provide motivation only to the “satisfactory” point) and their current level within the facility assessed. Two texts, *Measuring and Assessing Organizations* by Andrew H. Van de Ven and *Measuring and Enhancing the Productivity of Service and Government Organizations* by Marvin Everett Mundel, provide particular guidance in the

development and implementation of organizational assessment models, no matter what their conceptual framework.

### **General Considerations**

Van de Ven outlines general considerations which can actually be applied when working with either assessment process, or a combination of the two. This author was involved in the Organization Assessment Research Program, which “aimed to develop a framework, a set of measurement instruments, and a process that are scientifically valid and practically useful to assess on an ongoing basis” (4). He emphasizes the usefulness of organizational assessment as a tool to be used on a continuing basis. Regular assessment can illuminate trends and the effects of changes which take place between assessments, literally highlighting cause-and-effect relationships. Of course, this use would also require that organizational changes are documented and included in assessment analysis.

Van de Ven also identifies four levels of organizational assessment: the overall organization, organizational units, individual jobs/positions, and the relations within and between these various elements. For Trent Radio, organizational units will likely not be considered as the facility is decidedly small by business standards and does not have identified units. This level of consideration would apply to larger organizations and franchises.

At the time of writing the text, Van de Ven was not at a stage in research development where he could offer a standardized process, but the following three main considerations were offered:

- Who decides measures for criteria?;
- Whose conceptual model should be used?; and,

- How to facilitate learning and use of results? (22).

He later goes on to outline the pros and cons of assessment design and administration as executed by either internal or external personnel. For example, internal personnel are more informed, but may find more difficulty in maintaining objectivity, while external personnel can see those organizational elements which are taken for granted, but can be less sensitive to the effects of the evaluation process on the staff. To alleviate the problems associated with each option, Van de Ven suggests a close collaboration between internal and external personnel. Each can bring their own advantages to the table while at the same time keep the disadvantages of the other in check. It is in this way that the questions listed above will be answered for the Trent Radio organizational assessment.

The measures for criteria will be developed primarily by the student, the party external to the organization; however, this development will be through consultation with Trent Radio board, staff, volunteers, and a representative sample of programmers. The conceptual model is prescribed, being the failure-focus model discussed in the introduction. This model was conceptualized internally (by General Manager John K. Muir), but the practical design will be executed by the student, which will require a refinement of the model. The task of facilitation of learning and use of results for the primary user (the General Manager) is that of the student, while extension of this learning and use to others involved at Trent Radio is that of the internal party. It is especially important that the external developer maintains a concern of the relevance of the study for its users (Van de Ven 30).

Keeping these general considerations in mind, the detailed process models can be explored.

### **Models of Process**

Van de Ven presents a six-step process to organizational analysis:

1. Evaluation Prerequisites;
2. Goals Exploration;
3. Criteria Development;
4. Evaluation Design;
5. Evaluation Implementation; and,
6. Data Analysis, Feedback, and Evaluation (31).

While the list may seem condensed and concise, each process element is broad and this framework allows for use towards a variety of assessment models and methods (including failure-focused assessment).

Mundel provides a process model with more than twice as many steps as Van de Ven's. This model includes more specific components which could possibly be reworked to apply to Trent Radio (specifically those related to the measurement, budgeting and management of what he calls "manpower"), but these were considered much too detailed and extraneous for a small community NFP organization. Likewise, Mundel's Step 8 (Reduce Data to Standards) has been left without consideration. The Failure model looks at unachievable perfection rather than standards in order to perpetuate motivation. Six of Mundel's steps have been selected for integration into the process model for this project:

Step 1 – General Reconnaissance;

Step 2 – Work-Unit Structure;

Step 3 – Select Measurement Methods;

Step 6 – Familiarize those Affected with Approach;

Step 7 – Apply Measurements; and,

Step 13 – Provide Follow-Up Assistance (59).

These steps will be integrated into Van de Ven's model to form the following comprehensive organizational assessment process model for use in the development and implementation of the "Key Indicators of Failure" assessment:

1. General Reconnaissance;
2. Evaluation Prerequisites;
3. Goals Exploration;
4. Work-Unit Structure;
5. Criteria Development / Selecting Work Measurement Methods;
6. Evaluation Design;
7. Evaluation Implementation / Applying Work Measurements;
8. Data Analysis, Feedback & Evaluation;
9. Providing Follow-Up.

The task of "Familiarizing Those to be Affected" will not be included in this step-by-step process because it is to be considered an ongoing element independent of the stage of advancement of the process itself.

### **Process Elements**

1. General Reconnaissance: The General Reconnaissance, as Mundel instructs, is meant to be a quick exam of the nature of the work, the organization, and the personnel (60). The student will gain a sense of the operations and organizational culture, assess the

attitude of the staff towards the project, become familiar with any previous evaluations, appreciate current problems, and identify those individuals “in-the-know” (61). The rapport developed at this stage should be maintained throughout the project. Mundel suggests engaging in individual discussions rather than group meetings for this step.

2. Evaluation Prerequisites: In this stage, the evaluation project is defined. A working contract is developed to clarify the roles of those involved, and resources are identified. A budget of time and finances may also be set/presented.

3. Goals Exploration: At this point, the assessment developer should conduct a series of meetings in order to assess what goals Trent Radio’s stakeholders have for the organization. Primary stakeholders include Board members, staff, volunteers and programmers. The Trent student body should also likely be included as stakeholders, given their position as funders, but a representative survey of this group may be extensive given the time constraints of this project at this time. Such a survey could be considered for future assessments. Even with the group of stakeholders mentioned above, the interviews should reflect multiple, possibly conflicting, expectations for Trent Radio.

Van de Ven states that judgments of performance are also concurrently value judgments (14). These performance judgments and goals also represent the desired outputs for the organization. The next step for the developer is to connect actual operations to real or desired outputs.

4. Work-Unit Structure: The work-unit structure outlines the input-output flow for the organization. It is through this deconstruction that the developer will analyze the workings of Trent Radio and discover how these operations produce the real and/or desired outputs. This analysis will also reveal those elements of operations which offer



feasible measurements for quantitative evaluation. Mundel defines 8 levels of the work-unit structure: motion, element, task, intermediate product, end product, program, gross output and results (30). This framework seems reminiscent of Taylor's Scientific Management, and Trent Radio's creative and intangible operative style would not allow the imposition of such prescriptive measures; however, the general concept can still be followed.

5. Criteria Development / Selecting Work Measurement Methods: Mundel boldly states that "all work can be subjected to measurement" (68). Once the work-unit structure is understood, measurable operations which lead directly to desired outputs can then be identified. Van de Ven suggests that criteria be variable (and therefore useful), reliable, and low cost (36). Both authors point out that criteria should be as broad as possible, taking into account multiple detailed elements, rather than assessing each smaller element. Further, it should be ensured that the measurement criteria actually support the future acceptability of the end report (this direct relation should be illustrated through the work-unit structure).

6. Evaluation Design: At this point, the developer will design all aspects of the evaluation, including forms, data storage, implementation methods, timeframe, and reports to be generated. Criterion diction should reflect organizational jargon. The limitations of the evaluation should be discussed with the users (the General Manager, for the case of Trent Radio), and these limitations must be agreed upon by the user(s) before the evaluation is implemented.

7. Evaluation Implementation / Applying Work Measurements: Once the terms of the evaluation design have been agreed upon and those affected have been notified and

consulted and no logistic or political issues remain, the steps outlined by this design should be implemented. Concerns during this stage include:

- Maintaining integrity and controls on uniformity of data collection;
- Tracking responses;
- Recording unanticipated events which may affect results; and,
- Responding to feelings of threat and sensitivities of respondents and users (40).

Mundel suggests using preliminary data to test the effectiveness of the use of the data while it is being collected, in order to make necessary changes in a timely manner. Those changes which are not made during this evaluation period can also be implemented during the next round, but need to be recorded and integrated into the design (78).

8. Data Analysis, Feedback & Evaluation: In this stage, the data collected is entered into the data information system developed in the evaluation design, likely a computerized system. The analysis procedure outlined in the design is then executed and reports are generated. Users should be met with in order to analyze, interpret and learn from the results. This meeting should begin with a review of the purposes, goals, criteria, design and conduct of the evaluation. Van de Ven states that the user group will naturally engage in questions and discussion as results are brought forward. Internal strengths and weaknesses will be revealed and debates about organizational conditions may occur, which optimally will lead to positive change. Other goals which have not been assessed will also become apparent, and these can be integrated into the design for the following period's analysis.

9. Providing Follow-Up: At this point, the external evaluation producer will ensure that the users and future evaluation administrators understand and will be able to

carry on the process in future periods, given that organizational assessment is more effective when completed on an ongoing basis. Process documentation will be completed, new sub-systems will be added if required, inefficiencies can be identified and redesigned, result implementation can begin, and management can be trained in data collection practices. The student should leave the assessment process in a fully operational state and see that improvements are under way.

### **Conclusion**

This outline details a comprehensive process, so in reality, these steps may not be fulfilled as completely as would be optimal. The assessment would however get its conceptual feet off the ground and expand, grow, and improve along with Trent Radio, given that commitment is given towards this improvement.

The process is ultimately a participatory one. While the student will take the responsible role of fulfilling the planning and administration, the assessment should be on the terms of the stakeholders. Failure is of course relative, depending on the aforementioned value judgments. This whole exercise, however, is a study of relativity and perspective. In reference to Douglas Adams' *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy*, what General Manager John K. Muir seeks is the "You Are Here" arrow pointing to a microscopic dot on a microscopic dot in relation to the infinity of the universe.

### **Works Cited**

- Mundel, Marvin Everett. *Measuring and Enhancing the Productivity of Service and Government Organizations*. Tokyo: Asian Productivity Organization, 1975.
- Van de Ven, Andrew H. *Measuring and Assessing Organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1980.



*An Experience of Failure*  
By Lily J. Mills  
0165927  
For: Professor R. Dart, ADMN 491H  
April 18, 2007

## **Introduction**

Although it might seem too obvious, students do not often think about their classes as “learning experiences.” The term is more often applied to real-life situations, such that classes are considered to offer “simulations” or merely think-tanks for the “real world.” The Trent Centre for Community-Based Education (TCCBE), however, provides opportunities for learning experiences which are practical, applied and integrated into this “real world.” By coordinating with organizations in Peterborough and the surrounding area, the Centre allows students to explore credit-earning options outside of the classroom.

This document is to exist as my own personal reflection of my learning experience which was made possible through the TCCBE. The following phases have been identified in the process:

- Project Discovery;
- Understanding of Project;
- Curriculum Development;
- Research;
- Brainstorming;
- The Images of Organization Survey;
- Survey Development;
- Survey Execution;

- Reporting;
- Interpretation; and,
- Model Evaluation.

These phases should be seen as only loosely chronological. In reality, each phase overlapped with the phase immediately preceding and immediately following it to some extent. While this reflection process is also yet another important and integral phase of the learning experience, discussion concerning it has not been herein included, in order to avoid redundancy!

### **Project Discovery**

I began the project discovery process late into last summer, as I had been on the waiting list for two other business half-credits all summer and suspected that I would not be getting into them. My first order of business was to browse the projects listed on the TCCBE website ([www.trentu.ca/tccbe](http://www.trentu.ca/tccbe)). I was looking for something both applicable to business as well as related to my chosen field of arts and culture (I am actually a Cultural Studies major, taking a minor in Business Administration).

Projects which looked interesting to me included an audience survey for Peterborough New Dance, the development of a self-evaluation model for OPIRG, a “listenership” survey and Indicators of Failure evaluation model (the former two to be completed for Trent Radio, each constituting a separate project). Further research into what each project would entail was sought through Barb Woolner, Projects Coordinator with the Centre, who sent me a 2-3 page long synopsis of each project.

Further support in the quest for the perfect project was sought through the supervising professor, Professor Ray Dart. Prof. Dart graciously agreed to supervise the

project in August. I had chosen to approach this particular professor because I had enjoyed taking a first-year business class with him and remembered that he had done quite a bit of work with not-for-profits. He guided me through the project decision process by encouraging me to find something that really interested me and would be applicable to my future endeavours.

Throughout this process, I also decided that I would complete this Community-Based Education project for half-credit only in the winter semester. The planning process was taking too long for me to be comfortable with taking on the project in September, and this ended up being acceptable as my selected project suited a semester's worth of work.

After reviewing the project profiles, I decided to have meetings with OPIRG and Trent Radio to get a better sense of the projects and the people with whom I would be working. OPIRG's project seemed fairly straightforward and logical. When I met with John K. Muir, General Manager of Trent Radio, however, I found that the project he was envisioning (for the Indicators of Failure model) was much more abstract and conceptual. I felt that this project was more challenging to grasp and therefore would make for a more fulfilling and interesting learning experience.

### **Understanding of Project**

Coming to fully understand what John was looking for took more than one meeting. Thinking in terms of failure rather than success is a bit unorthodox for most evaluation models. John's logic was that Trent Radio already knew where it was doing well and that finding the failures would provide opportunities for learning and growth for the organization. John showed me around the Trent Radio facility twice, suggested some



reading to me (sections from *Resistance Through Rituals*, edited by Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson), and met with me about four times before I truly understood what he was going for. At one point, John explained that he wasn't interested in creating standards, because standards create a level of "acceptable" failure and do not necessarily encourage growth once they have been successfully met. For quite a while, I had been under the impression that creating standards was exactly what I would be doing. On the contrary, John was looking for a conceptualization of perfection, and then seeing how far away Trent Radio was from it. Rather than the great mark of 80% on the report card, John wanted to focus on the 20% deficiency. My ability to understand John's thinking was facilitated not only through the reading he suggested, but also through a section of the radio recording of *The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy* by Douglas Adams. Once I had tapped into John's thinking, the development of the project became one hundred percent easier.

### **Curriculum Development**

Of course, for this project to be legitimated as a fourth-year university course, a curriculum for student evaluation had to be developed between myself and Professor Dart. Although the project which Trent Radio sought would obviously be one deliverable, it would not be the only one. The project outline process and creation intended to identify the purpose of the project, the key research questions, the project methodology, the project timeline, resources which would be required of Trent Radio, the deliverables to Professor Dart (as well as their respective weights in relation to the final evaluation of the student), and the responsibilities of each party (the student, the supervising professor, the host organization, and the TCCBE).

The development of this document took place over a few weeks towards the end of the semester preceding the project and a couple weeks into the project semester. Its development occurred largely through brainstorming between me and Professor Dart, through meetings and e-mail correspondence. I searched the library catalogue to find research readings which would be appropriate for background reading dealing with surveys, organizational analysis, and radio. The resultant outline was reviewed and signed by all parties. For the most part, the guidelines set out in the curriculum were subsequently followed.

### **Research**

Doing the background research was a hurried process as it seemed logical that one would need to complete this step before moving into the meat-and-potatoes of the project. I did, however, identify which chapters and sections could be read while completing other parts of the project. For example, the chapters in Elizabeth G. Baldwin's Master's Thesis entitled *Community Radio: The Development of a Voluntary Organization* which dealt with business aspects could be read later while I worked on the Radio Facility and Community Service Role sections of the project.

Each reading brought something new to my understanding of the project and each I found to be more or less relevant than the others. The De Bono text (*Six Thinking Hats*) was useful for taking a critical approach, but seemed more applicable to idea generation rather than organizational analysis. *Measuring and Enhancing The Productivity of Service and Government Organizations* by Marvin E. Mundel, Ph. D. was extremely comprehensive and convoluted. The processes described in the book did not have exact applicability to Trent Radio as measuring output is so abstract, and output was the

primary focus of the text. *Measuring and Assessing Organizations*, by Andrew H. Van de Ven, however, gave a more general focus to evaluating organizations, noting some varied models which could be applied (none of which focused on measuring failure). The *Organizational Surveys* text by Allen I. Kraut was extremely helpful in terms of outlining the processes and pitfalls of initiating organizational surveys. During the actual survey process, I actually came across all of the points of theory mentioned by Kraut in the text. *Resistance Through Rituals* (Hall and Jefferson) provided an aspect of political and cultural thought into the project, allowing me to see the various ways in which Trent Radio might be considered unsuccessful within its contexts. The last chapter of *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting* by Frank W. Peers (Chapter 17: “Interpretations”) provided a convenient overview of the logic behind the different types of radio organizations – public, private/commercial, and community.

A total of 22.5 hours was spent reading for this course.

### **Brainstorming**

The development and execution of the project was largely completed on Tuesdays at the Trent Radio facility. This *in situ* work allowed me to observe the goings-on at the site and understand what exactly might need to be evaluated. I saw people prepare (or not prepare) for shows, saw them interact with John, and listened to them actually on the radio. This presence also allowed me to interrupt John whenever I needed an answer to a question and look up records/files as needed. Although I did not see the entire year-long process, and was never able to attend a meeting of the Board, I gained an understanding of the meat-and-potatoes of Trent Radio. Other work was completed at home as necessary.

The brainstorming process was largely informed by my conversations with John Muir. Over the four formal and various impromptu meetings, I quite possibly learned more about Trent Radio than many of the programmers. It was through those meetings that I was able to develop the initial general outline (Radio Facility, Community Service Role, and Business/Operational Failures) and later elaborate upon what each of these Failures would entail. Brainstorming yielded the areas for analysis, but not the analysis itself.

### **The Images of Organization Survey**

Inspiration for this survey sprouted from learning about Moore's Images of Organizations in my Social Organizations class. The questions in this survey were forwarded to Trent Radio Programmers, Volunteers, and Staff members:

- If Trent Radio was a machine, what would it make or do?
- If Trent Radio was an organism, where would it fit in its food chain? How does it survive (cow eats grass) and what does it in turn help to survive (cow feeds calf)?
- Remember in cartoons those shots of looking into someone's brain and seeing monkeys or a spider web or nothing at all? If you could look into Trent Radio's brain (or the brain that is Trent Radio) what would be going on?
- If Trent Radio was a culture, what values and beliefs would it be known for (like the rumour that Canadians are exceptionally polite)?
- If Trent Radio was a political system, what would it be (for example, anarchy, democracy, tyranny, etc.)? For a full list of political systems, see [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_forms\\_of\\_government](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_forms_of_government).
- 6. If Trent Radio was a brainwasher, what would its subliminal messages tell you?

The original intention of this survey was to uncover what kinds of questions I should be asking in the surveys, but in reality they provided another, more qualitative, opportunity for finding Trent Radio's failures. The answers received were aggregated, alphabetized for anonymity, and shared with John Muir as well as Laurel Paluck, Programme Director, and Jill Staveley, Production Manager. The answers were informally compared to what John had told me about the organization. In some cases responses seemed congruent, in others, they radically differed. Furthermore, it introduced the various parties involved at Trent Radio to myself, my project and the survey process. Because of the wide proliferation of this survey, and the number of informative responses, personal interviews never did take place. I felt that personal interviews would have given a more micro-organizational view, while the project was meant to be more focused on macro-organizational concerns. I have advised that the survey be extended every year in order to compliment the quantitative survey process with a more qualitative aspect.

### **Survey Development**

The greatest challenge in survey development was finding the calculable key to each aspect of a failure set. For example, how would one find out a measurable quantity of by how much Trent Radio fails to provide user-friendly equipment? The answer was often to be found in (levels\*), which were used in Programmer and Staff/Volunteer surveys. This system provided a numerical measurement with a conceivable level of perfection (5). For every survey question, it was necessary to include a corresponding question on the master evaluation form for the failure type. The surveys were geared for

each of the three failure types to be presented separately. Other survey questions required Yes/No answers or quantities (i.e., How many times...?).

I perhaps did not take my use of language into account as much as I should have. Although the radio programmers, specifically those associated with Trent Radio, are well educated/well-read, my language at times can be convoluted, and I received a few confused comments about my questions at times.

The evaluation model did not always necessarily correspond with survey questions. Some questions were also based on pre-fabricated and newly required records/files to provide measurements of failure, often in comparison with the previous year or in frequency of negative occurrences (to be recorded during the year as they occur).

### **Survey Execution**

Many cues in the survey execution process were taken from the *Organizational Surveys* text. Participants were given a choice of response forms in order to appeal to different preferences – MSWord file or paper copy. Unfortunately, response via MSWord and subsequent e-mail did not ensure anonymity; however, I was likely considered a neutral intermediary given my lack of personal involvement with Trent Radio (in some instances it was obvious that I was considered an outsider, given the sometimes disrespectful responses). Paper copies were made available in the Trent Radio sitting area. Each of these formats enabled respondents to include digressions beyond the requested yes/no or 1-5 scale\* answer, which allowed for a greater comprehension of how the surveyed participants felt about what they were being asked.

Signs were posted (and noted as being from John) indicating that these surveys were available and that the e-mail should be noted. An introductory e-mail was also sent out to let potential respondents know about the project and the upcoming surveys. It outlined the survey schedule, which showed when surveys would be available and their optimal return time. Although I did not need the surveys back until much later necessarily, it was advisable to give a psychological “due date” in order to increase responses (as otherwise, surveys may be marginalized and then forgotten). Even after the due dates, they were issued a second time to remind and encourage those who had not yet completed it. In only a couple instances did programmers complain that they considered this process to be “spam.” Paper copies were anonymously delivered to the Trent Radio mailbox.

The survey execution process went very smoothly overall. Operators (one of which is present during all live broadcasting hours) were instructed to encourage individual Programmers to fill out the surveys, as well as partake in the process themselves. Very few questions were asked, although that does not necessarily mean that questions did not exist. While I did receive a few e-mails of thanks and encouragement from Programmers, my contact with them was highly impersonal, unfortunately. If I had more time, I could have visited the facility every day of the week and met all of the Programmers, Staff and Volunteers. Many questions were generally included on the forms after they were turned in, when they did occur. As would be expected, the number of surveys returned declined with each round as survey fatigue and disinterest set in; however, I believe that this three-step process was more effective than presenting all of the questions at one time.

## **Reporting**

Reporting of the results involved the tabulation of the survey responses. Once all responses for the same question were aggregated (using Microsoft Excel), failure points were calculated, either through quantity-summary or through reverse-averaging. The reverse-averaging process involves tabulating results, finding the average and then subtracting that average from the perfection level of 5. In this way, the distance between the average answer and perfection was calculated. This reverse-averaging process was completed for most \*\* questions, whereas 1 was the most negative response and 5 the most positive. (Instructions for the completion of each failure point calculation are included in the master evaluation forms.)

Also included in the Excel spreadsheets were qualitative comments included in the surveys. Lists (such as which audio genres are seen by Programmers to be lacking) were also tabulated and included.

## **Interpretation**

After failure points were tabulated, the hard results had to be interpreted so the numbers could provide meaning. Trends (such as three comments about the facility being uncomfortably “chilly”) were noted and lists of worded suggestions were included. With regards to the reverse-averages in the master evaluation, it was found that these differences were generally under the level 2. Thus, any exceptions (i.e. those reverse-averages of 2 or higher) were noted in the interpretation. Not every failure point was included in the interpretation. The focus was placed on analysis points which yielded relatively higher levels of failure points.



The interpretation document merely notes the failures; however, due to the quantitative nature of the evaluation, pure problems at the root of these failures, as well as their solutions, are not assessed and provided. The next step in this process would be to investigate the reasons behind the results (although very often they may be seemingly obvious) and then remedy these problems. Priorities would also have to be set (although a partial prioritization has taken place through my decision to note only those failures which seem relatively high, while some seemingly smaller problems may in fact be of more consequence).

### **Model Evaluation**

I simultaneously undertook a micro-evaluation of my own evaluation. Subject to this analysis were typos, numerical errors, errors in calculation instructions, issues of confusion and concern in survey questions (such as questions which may be considered too uncomfortable for respondents), and suggestions in diction. These edits will be applied to the digital files before they are handed over to Trent Radio.

An evaluation of the model with a broader focus, such as the ability or inability of the surveys and questions to truly uncover Trent Radio's failures, will need to be completed on a continuous process. The evaluation documents and process should be reviewed at least annually in order to keep congruent with changes within the organization and its environment. For example, questions concerning certain pieces of equipment or organizational positions will likely become antiquated over time, assuming changes do in fact take place.

### **Conclusion**

I found that the bulk of the learning in the process took place, for me, during the survey planning and development stages. This provided a strong grounding for me if ever again I partake in developing an organizational analysis or any survey process for that matter. I feel that the failure-focused approach was unorthodox and may be a unique perspective which I would be able to any evaluation process.

It was also highly informative to discover how Trent Radio itself works, as well as learning to understand the mind of General Manager John K. Muir. Learning about community radio was what I found to be most interesting about the project. I enjoy learning about organizations and communities, but I prefer even better to be involved. This project, I felt, restricted me to the position of an outside consultant and observer. I would much more have preferred to learn and observe from within; however, each perspective has its own advantages and disadvantages for evaluation. For example, the viewpoint of an outsider may be considered more objective, but the viewpoint of an insider may see the more subtle aspects of an organization which might not be captured by an outsider. At the same time, becoming an insider while assuming the mindset of an outside evaluator might be possible, such as with a secret shopper. A search for failures could also be done by assigning a student to actually participate in the programming and volunteering processes. Hopefully I will be able to achieve a more involved and personal experience of radio through my production internship with CBC Radio.

